



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,578	03/27/2007	Katsuya Yamashita	40030647-03	5502
27623 7590 08/07/2008 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR STAMFORD, CT 06901				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, KHANH V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2817				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/579,578

Applicant(s)

YAMASHITA, KATSUYA

Examiner

Khanh V. Nguyen

Art Unit

2817

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/17/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

QUAYLE

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 5, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 1, line 7, "the current" should correctly be -- current --.

Claim 1, line 9, "said output terminal part" should correctly be -- said output part -
-.

Claim 1, line 12, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 1, line 15, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 1, line 16, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 1, line 18, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 1, line 20, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 2, page 20, line 1, should "second external signals" be -- second external
signal --? Note, claim 1, lines 16-17, discloses "a first external signal" in singular form.

Claim 2, line 1, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 2, line 3, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 2, line 3, "the output" should correctly be -- output --.

Claim 5, lines 21-22, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 1, "the current" should correctly be -- current --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 3, "said output terminal part" should correctly be -- said output part --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 6, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 9, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 10, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 12, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 5, page 21, line 14, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 6, lines 20-21, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 6, line 23, "the current" should correctly be -- current --.

Claim 6, page 22, line 1, "said output terminal part" should correctly be -- said output part --.

Claim 6, page 22, line 4, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 6, page 22, line 7, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 6, page 22, line 8, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 6, page 22, line 10, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 6, page 22, line 12, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 7, lines 18-19, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 7, line 21, "the current" should correctly be -- current --.

Claim 7, line 23, "said output terminal part" should correctly be -- said output part --.

Claim 7, page 23, line 2, "the signals" should correctly be -- signals --.

Claim 7, page 23, line 5, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Claim 7, page 23, line 6, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 7, page 23, line 8, "ineffective" should correctly be -- disabled --.

Claim 7, page 23, line 10, "effective" should correctly be -- enabled --.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 are allowed.

Claims 1-7 call for, among others, multiple input parts is made effective and the others of the input parts are made ineffective in response to a first external signal, the impedance of the first input terminal, the second input terminal, and the output terminal of the ineffective input parts become high and the output current from the first output terminal become zero, and only the signals input to the effective input parts are thereby amplified.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The additional references (Maschhoff (6,489,845); Carreto et al. (7,307,477)) show further analogous prior art circuitry.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on 571-272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Khanh Van Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2817

